



the bullet

vol. 43/no. 11/january 12, 1970

WOMEN
ARE APPRECIATED
BUT MAY
NOT ENTER

the **bullet**

vol. 43/no. 11/january 12, 1970

MWC to begin coeducating next year

by Barbara Halliday

The first male application for admission to MWC since Chancellor Simpson's Dec. 18 announcement to accept applications from males was received last week by the admissions office.

In his announcement, Simpson said that he would ask the 1970 General Assembly to remove any language from the Code of Virginia, Section 23.86, creating MWC in 1944 as the undergraduate college of arts and sciences for women, which could be construed as making the enrollment of male students illegal.

According to Michael Houston assistant to the chancellor, the wording in the code does not necessarily make the enrollment of men at MWC illegal. After World War II until 1960 GI's were accepted at MWC; the last male graduated from the school in 1958. Non-resident men are currently admitted to the MWC summer session. Simpson's announcement was part of a re-

sponse to a statement made by U.Va counsel James H. Michael, Jr. during a hearing in Richmond on sex discrimination charges against the University of Virginia on Dec. 17. Michael, in defense to ACLU lawyer John C. Lowe's assertion that MWC is restricted by statute from admitting men, said that the statute does not bar the admission of men and that MWC is "responding favorably now" to applications from males.

A letter from Director of Admissions A. Ray Merchant is being sent along with application forms mailed to men which says, "... Mary Washington College admits only women to its regular 1969-70 academic session. Thus, no men are currently in attendance, either as day or residential students. While I am unable to state whether our admissions policies will be changed for future sessions, such policies are now under study."

The administration has not yet worked out a procedure for implementing the admission of

men to the college. In a statement to The Free Lance-Star, Merchant said, "We're taking it a day at a time ... We'll use the first couple (male applications) to hammer out a procedure."

The Future of the College Committee recommended in October, 1969, that the College consider admitting men to all sessions on a non-residential basis and that they plan for the enrollment of men on a residential basis.

A survey conducted in early 1969 showed that, at that time, 59.5 per cent of the students here wanted MWC to remain a women's college. An FOC committee survey shows that more than 50 per cent of the professors favor male enrollment at MWC.

In connection with the hearing on sex discrimination charges against U.Va., ACLU lawyer Philip J. Hirschop asked the special three-judge federal court to issue a blanket order barring sex discrimination in Virginia's state supported colleges and universities. No decision has yet been handed down by the court.

the bullet

vol. 43/no. 11/january 12, 1970

Coed Virginia Scott finds UVa campus "apathetic"

by Mary Anne Burns

ED. NOTE: The following is an interview with Virginia Anne Scott, the woman admitted to U.Va. after a court order forced the University to do so last fall.

"I can't" was her answer to the question "Now that you're in the University, do you see any reason why the University would not admit you without a court order?"

"I find the contrary, in fact. As for not having facilities, I see no lack of ability for providing for my presence." I've been trying to be objective as to why the University wouldn't want me. But, I simply can't find any reasons."

Professors have been "extremely sympathetic" in her case, and "generally helpful." Students, "like the majority of students at any college, are pretty apathetic. I've run into some amazing tirades from a

few people but they just generally feel threatened." She added that the little amount of controversy was "fine. I simply want to go to school."

"Of course, the attitude toward women in the United States is not too good and U.Va. is no exception in this regard."

Virginia Anne Scott is a freshman in the College of Arts and Sciences. Being admitted as a freshman was her particular role in *Kirstein v. U.Va.*, a case which is likely to be a historic decision in the history of women's rights in this country.

Last fall, in response to the court order, she was admitted "like any other student, simply under general procedure," she reports.

She's thinking about applying to law school. Was it her involvement with ACLU and this particular case which prompted this interest?

"No, it's more than that. This

interest is founded on a long time anger at the absence of justice. I feel if I can establish justice in my own environment I'll be doing something."

Has she found discrimination against women at UVA? "I've been to a few political meetings and gotten no static. The Cavalier Daily has girls on its staff. But I must confess that I haven't done much but go to class." She explained that ACLU advised her not to risk jeopardizing her academic status with involvement in outside activities.

"I am in a pressured position, because of my case, but really the pressure stems more from my obsession with doing things well once I start on them." She did find time, however, to be involved with the Moratorium.

Gradewise, "I may make Dean's List, although that really doesn't mean much. I'm waiting to see what final exams are like here. There's not much point in having them; you don't learn anything."

Virginia Anne Scott became involved in the lawsuit as the result of a family tragedy. A resident of Charlottesville almost all her life, she was attending William and Mary in Williamsburg when her mother became very sick. She dropped out after almost a semester in order to care for her mother at home. There was no way for her to pursue her education except to attend the University. She then went to Mr. Lowe for legal advice. Her mother died shortly thereafter.

Virginia's general comment on the lawsuit: "No regrets."

Changes sought in Va. abortion laws

by Jane Touzalin

In the wake of recent abortion law repeal in the District of Columbia, the state of Virginia recently proposed legislation making it possible for a woman to obtain a therapeutic abortion, under certain conditions.

According to a Richmond release, the proposal was introduced by the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council and would replace the existing laws which date back 120 years. Present Virginia legislation provides for abortion only in the event that the life of the mother would be in danger, were she to have the child.

The proposed changes were the result of a study by a group of 13 (including seven doctors, two women, and one clergyman) headed by State Senator J.D. Hagood, a doctor. Ruling that the present laws are "ineffective to prevent what they were enacted to accomplish and are not followed," the committee endorsed legalized abortions under the following conditions:

1. If a licensed physician believes that there is a possibility that the child could be born defective, either mentally or physically;

2. If the pregnancy occurred as a result of rape or incest;

3. If the physician believes that the physical or mental health of the mother will be impaired if the baby is allowed to be born.

This last provision, it is believed, will elicit the greatest amount of criticism since it is fairly ambiguous and open to many different interpretations. The committee did, however, designate three groups of women for whom having a child could have serious mental consequences. These groups are the very young, the old, and the emotionally disturbed.

Besides the mental consequences which might result from an unwanted pregnancy, the group also studied the social implications of the problem; "Does society benefit when the unwilling bear the unwanted? ... Some women who bear so-called unwanted children not only become a care to their husbands, fathers, and society, but also become so disturbed they cannot function properly as mothers and damage the life of the newborn child."

Although the proposed Virginia legislation seems to be a fairly radical step for this state, it is outdated in comparison with the recent ruling in Washington, D.C. which stated that the decision of having an abortion was strictly a private matter between the woman and her physician. The new Virginia plan has also been tested in other states and found ineffective. In a recent evaluation of California's similar Therapeutic Abortion Act of 1967, it was found that criminal abortions were still flourishing, and therapeutic ones could be afforded only by the wealthy. An educated estimate disclosed that approximately 10,000 criminal abortions were still being performed annually in spite of the more liberal legislation.

Other recent activities in abortion legislation occurred in New York last February, when the State Legislature was considering a bill which would change the wording in the abortion statutes from "to preserve a woman's life" to "to preserve a woman's health." When the Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of Public Health met with a panel of 11 "experts" to discuss the law, New York members of the Women's Liberation Movement showed up to protest the meeting on the grounds that the panel was unacceptable. Not only did the Public Health committee include no women, but the 11-member panel was composed of 10 men and one nun. The women charged that "abortion legislation is class legislation, imposed on women by a male-supremacist society, and deprives women of control over their bodies."

To many observers, the D.C. decision will soon be a guideline for other states which wish to repeal all abortion laws. It is anticipated that they will have little trouble following in the footsteps of the Washington court; for, in order for the people who want to maintain present legislation to succeed in their efforts, they must demonstrate that these laws are successful in deterring abortions and preventing fetal deaths. And as it was demonstrated last month in California, not even liberal therapeutic abortion laws are capable of preventing these occurrences.



(photos by Bob Gill, courtesy of The Cavalier Daily)

U. Va. coed Virginia Scott
... "no regrets" about University suit

(Feature Editor's Note: The following interview was conducted with a student from Mary Washington College who underwent a therapeutic abortion during the last school year. Any names given are not actually those of the people involved.)

BULLET: Well, first of all, when did it all happen?

SUBJECT: Well, it was last April . . . I had the pregnancy test in April, and I had the abortion two weeks later. The whole procedure took about two weeks from the time I found out to the time I had it.

B: Then you knew who to go to?

"When you get pregnant you realize what a crime it is that abortions aren't legal everywhere"

S: I found out from some kids here.

B: Did you have any misgivings at all, before you had it, about having an abortion?

S: No, because I knew that was the only thing that could happen—I mean, we weren't going to get married. The only thing was, I didn't consider any quacks at all. I had all these possibilities that people were telling me about but they were mostly illegal, and there was no way. I don't care how desperate somebody is, she shouldn't have an illegal abortion; they might come out all right, but it's just not worth it. I knew that if it wasn't going to be legal and in the hospital I wasn't going to have it. The only bad thing was that my mother finally found out about it.

Anyway, I had no misgivings about it—no emotional damage

"As far as I'm concerned, a fetus isn't a human life"

and no physical damage. I just can't believe that I'm well. I didn't have any problem at all: I didn't go crazy, I didn't have a nervous breakdown, and I'm very happy that I had it. When you get pregnant you realize what a crime it is that abortions aren't legal everywhere . . . you want to go out and fight, you want to tell everybody in the world, go on TV—everything.

B: What was the procedure? Did you go to a doctor first?

S: First I went to a psychiatrist. I went in and spent a half hour with him and it was \$50 . . . finally at the end of the time he said, "Well, I guess you have a problem, so let me write this letter for you." And he asked me my age and I said 21, and that I was a junior. I lied to him, because I wasn't sure whether he would be O.K. about falsifying my age. He said, "Now tell me, are you really 21?" and I said, "No I'm not, I'm 20." So he said, "Well, let me just put down 21 here, be-

cause that's going to be a minor problem." So then he told me to go to another psychiatrist, because at that time you had to have two letters. So he gave me his letter and I called the other psychiatrist and went to see him within that same week. Things have changed now because you don't need two psychiatrists anymore, as far as I know. Now the rule is that you only need one letter of approval. Anyway, then I went to the gynecologist and brought him the letters; and he examined me and said, "My secretary will call you as soon as we can get you into the hospital." It just went so smoothly; once I saw the first doctor everything just went into place. It was amazing that I didn't break down. It just seemed like

there was nothing else to do but have an abortion; I had to. It's no way to start off a marriage and I wouldn't want to get married anyhow. I have absolutely no regrets; I'm not ashamed of it. It was really great; I had to have it.

B: You wouldn't have considered having the baby and putting it up for adoption?

S: No, I couldn't do it, because I love kids too much. I know that if I had carried a pregnancy nine months I wouldn't have wanted to give it up; emotionally it would have been much worse. Because as far as I'm concerned, a fetus isn't a human life, so I really didn't think of it as losing a child when I had the abortion. But if I'd had a nine months pregnancy and had the child, it would have been worse; I wouldn't ever even consider giving it up for adoption. Plus

if I'd done that, then my parents would have had to find out about it, and so the best thing was to have an abortion. My parents would have just died. And I don't know what the school would have done.

B: Did this take any time off from school?

S: I went into the hospital on a Monday, the day after Mothers' Day, in fact, and I didn't cut any classes that day. I checked in about one o'clock, and you have to have tests; they gave me the preliminary tests. I was in the operating room at 8:30 Tuesday morning and I went home that day; at about 4:30 I left the hospital. It just took no time at all. I cut my Tuesday classes, but that was minor.

I remember when I was in the recovery room and I was just coming to, I cried; I don't know why I cried, I think it was a reaction to everything. And I remember asking the nurse the most stupid question: whether she could tell if it was a girl or a boy. So there was a woman

next to me on a cot, and she had just had an abortion too and I remember her saying that her husband didn't know about it; I guess he thought she was just going in for a D&C. But she was very happy, she was so relieved. And I remember saying, "Well, I don't have a husband," and she said, "God bless you." It was really a moving experience.

B: How soon after the operation were you up and around?

S: That night, because some friends came to get me and we went out to celebrate. You have to have somebody pick you up from the hospital, because the anesthetic has to wear off. I had no pain afterwards at all. I just can't believe it really happened.

B: Looking back at it now, how do you feel about it?

S: Happier. Because the baby would have been born over Christmas vacation; and I was thinking about it, and I thought, well I love kids, and maybe it would have been nice to have one, but boy am I glad I didn't! Because now I would have had the baby and it would have been over but it would have been six months later, and it would have been a lot more trying emotionally if I'd had the baby and given it up. It would have been a lot worse. I'm just really glad. And I can joke about it too, and even when it was happening, because Bill stood by me the whole time; and we kind of joked around about it, once we knew everything was going to be all right. We just took it really light-heartedly. As long as you keep your sense of humor—it sounds impossible, but it really helps. All I can say is that they should be legal, and they should be cheaper, because the money is ridiculous for a thing like that. It takes 40 minutes in the operating room.

B: I read recently that it takes only two minutes for the actual operation.

S: That's right. It's just a scraping of the uterus, so how long can that take? Plus the fact that how big is a fetus? It's 3/8 of an inch long at five weeks and I was about six weeks pregnant so what was it? almost an inch long? That's not a life, I'm sorry, that's not a life.

I remember we were studying it in Biology at the time I was pregnant and he was going step by step through my pregnancy. I had to get up and just walk

out of class.

B: How much did your abortion cost altogether?

S: Altogether it came to about \$650. Bill was able to get a loan for \$690, cash, from some credit union. They gave it to him with no problem; and I got the cash and a friend kept it for me in

her bank account. The psychiatrists were \$50 each. The fee for the operation, for the gynecologist, was \$250, for the one I went to; some of them are \$300. You have to have a down payment when you go into the hospital; that was about \$170, I think. It ran into money taking buses up and back to Washington, because I didn't have a car all the time. If you have the money, you're going to be able to get one. But now, someone told me that you have to be a legal resident of D.C. to get one there. Anyway, one good thing is that you don't have to pay anybody right away, except the hospital.

But I had no qualms about it; I didn't feel like I was murdering anybody—plus you see I'm Catholic, but I haven't been to church since the beginning of sophomore year. When my mother found out, the first thing she said was, in her tears, "Have you been to a priest?" That was her major concern; now it didn't

"I knew if my family found out, it would have killed them . . . that was my biggest hang-up"

bother me at all. But I know it really wrecked her; she's much a Puritan about sex. I think if I didn't have parents like I do, I might even have had the baby. But it was the threat that, I knew if my family found out, it would have killed them. And that was my biggest hang-up. I just wish that it all didn't have to be so close-mouthed. Why couldn't I have been able to just come out and say, "I'm pregnant; I'm having an abortion." Why does it all have to be so hidden? It's reality. And it's happening more and more all the time. I don't know why we can't break loose and just accept these things; it's just a tragedy. I would have another one if I got pregnant again, which I won't.

B: How would you feel if your daughter had one?

S: I don't know how I'd feel. It's harder when you look at it like that. I hope she would come to me; I'd probably help her get one. It's like when I think about my daughter smoking pot or

he gets back we may get married.

B: What if you end up marrying someone else?

S: I figure that the person I marry will be the type who will understand, anyway; because I wouldn't marry anybody who put his wife up on a pedestal, and felt she had to be a virgin. If it's not Bill, I probably will tell him. But only if it came up; I'm not going to say, "I have something to confess to you, and if you still want to marry me . . ."

Actually, the whole experience ended up bringing Bill and me closer together. Before, when I went out with him, I would always end up crying; this was before everything started falling into place and when I had just found out, and he understood in a way. But one time I made the comment that I wished I could have it, and he got mad at me. But if we had gotten married and had the baby, our whole relationship

would be shot. It's just great now, even though he's in Viet Nam.

It's funny to see how much I changed. When I came to college I was the most naive thing in the world. Now I don't even feel guilty about it. But now when I have my period, I just sit back and enjoy every little cramp!

This is the last issue of the semester. The BULLET will resume publication in February.

Thiel to meet with Visitors

Honor Council President Kathy Thiel will meet with some of the members of the Mary Washington committee of the Board of Visitors on Thursday for an informal discussion on the future of the honor system at MWC.

The meeting was originally scheduled for the purpose of discussing procedure for making a major change in the honor system. The Honor Council has been discussing the possibility of creating an alternative punishment to expulsion for an honor offense. Doing away with the honor system in the social realm has also been suggested and may be discussed at the meeting.

Dr. Simpson; Mr. Houston; Dean Whidden; Dean Croushore; Mr. Glover, advisor to the Honor Council; Mr. Willis, MWC attorney; and the lawyer who represents the Board of Visitors will also be present at the meeting.

Garskof advocates women's liberation

By Jane Touzalin

As the second feminist movement gains support across the country, MWC is observing the trend through a unique course being offered this semester only, entitled "The Psychology of Women."

The course is taught by Dr. Michele Garskof, an assistant professor of psychology now in her first year of teaching at MWC. Dr. Garskof initiated the course on a fairly experimental

level, as "just a bare beginning," because of her interest in women psychology, a relatively unexplored field. She is also a feminist, or, as she would prefer to call it, an advocate of women's liberation. "I think the implications shouldn't be different, but they are. Feminism brings to everybody's mind women wearing bloomers for the first time and being out fighting for the vote . . . for some reason, it does carry a lot of negative connotations, of women trying to

be like men. I think that women's liberation doesn't mean being like men; it means being free to develop in any of the ways that we have the potential to develop."

Like most feminist thinkers, Dr. Garskof is strongly against the sexual typecasting which takes place in the home, where a little girl is taught how to conform to society's idea of what a little girl should be, and a boy, in turn, is taught to be strong, masculine, and self-reliant. The effects of this, she feels, are not only harmful to women but to men also. "I feel that there are some things that men are lacking; and I'd like to liberate them, too, so they can feel, be more emotional, be more empathetic, relate to children, enjoy babies, and do other things that typically are left for us."

One of the focal points of women's liberation groups is the education of women. In an all-girls' school, especially, it is felt that the students are not taken seriously, as if they really want to learn, but are "educated" in a finishing school manner and further indoctrinated into the woman's traditional role in society. In contrast, men in school are inevitably pushed to get a good education, make money, and become a success. "Women's education, for some reason, leads most women to choose to seclude themselves in a suburban or city dwelling with an average of 2.5 children . . . not doing anything productive but raising a family; and raising a family badly, because children should not have that much adult supervision and that much attention from one individual," Dr. Garskof explains. As a result, the placid housewife becomes "a dull, semi-alcoholic, obese woman who stays home with infants all day and talks to other ladies like herself next door." In order to prevent this from happening, many feminist groups are calling for reforms in all-girls' schools where neither educational nor curricula can be obtained or, more commonly, are seeking total coeducation of



Dr. Michele Garskof

... Women's Liberation advocate

photo by Shelia Page

Statistics show women suffer job discrimination

by Jean Burgess and Genie Hamilton

In view of the statistical data concerning the exploitation of females, any woman who intends to attain a position of high rank within the labor force had better be prepared to "look like a girl, act like a lady, think like a man, and work like a dog." Only a small percentage of women achieve prominent positions; most are thrust into the lower prestige and sex-typed jobs. Within the labor force the idea of equal pay for equal work is an ideal rather than a reality for today's job-oriented female.

The 1960 Census Report revealed the following information:

OCCUPATIONS	MALE		FEMALE	
	no. in thousands	\$ per year	no. in thousands	\$ per year
Professional	4,543	6,692	2,793	3,870
Managerial	4,695	6,519	794	2,948
Clerical	3,120	5,011	6,497	3,122
Sales	3,055	4,990	1,746	1,505
Craft	8,973	5,582	268	3,125
Operative	9,234	4,477	3,612	2,489
Household	65	—	1,760	610
Service	2,745	3,412	3,020	1,636
Form	1,290	1,103	70	—
Laborer	3,405	2,868	125	412

The 1964 Women's Bureau Report indicated that women, in general, hold less responsible jobs. They dominate such occupations as nursing and household work by more than 90 per cent. The ratio of men to women in the labor force is 2:1, but this ratio varies drastically within a given occupation. Clearly, almost all occupations are sex-typed, with a few exceptions such as journalism. In the mid-1960's, 9% of all full professors were women, 8% of all scientists, 6% of all doctors, 3% of all lawyers, 2% of the power elite of the business world, 4% of the civil service workers in the top six ratings, and 1% of the United States Senate.

Thus, statistically, discrimination exists for women not only while holding a job—in terms of salaries—but, more importantly, in trying to obtain a male-oriented position. Two common rationalizations employers offer to justify discrimination of women are larger absentee rates and higher costs in fringe benefits.

A recent study on absenteeism has disputed this excuse—it was found that dull jobs which pay less are those with higher absentee rates. Since women dominate these jobs, employers assume that the high rates are due to sex rather than the type of work involved. The study revealed that a man in a mundane clerical position is absent more than a female in the same position. Employers use the argument that women cost more in fringe benefits only to justify employing them on a part time basis. According to most unions, pregnancy is considered a "natural illness" and therefore an employer is exempt from paying fringe benefits for child-bearing. In addition, no more than four percent of all employed women quit their jobs, in any one year, because of pregnancy.

The main social attitudes which account for the present discrimination against women are: first, that women are basically inferior to men in the occupational realm; second, that a woman's place is in the home, "and that her position as a wife and mother is primary;" and finally, that a married woman should only enter the labor force for reasons of economic necessity, and that her position therein should remain a secondary one.

On the positive side, concrete steps are being taken to abolish discriminatory practices. In 1961, President Kennedy established the Commission on the Status of Women. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 established the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission and included a clause which forbade discrimination. Using this act as its legislative basis, National Organization for Women (NOW) is prosecuting companies with discriminatory practices. It has picketed the New York Times for segregation of its want ads and has boycotted such companies as the Colgate-Palmolive for its unfair employment practices. In addition, it is working for the repeal of legislation which limits the length of the work day for women.

Women are not only subjected to unfair employment practices; but, more importantly, they are the victims of social stigmas which discourage ambition, suppress talent, and deprive society of the full female potential. It is only when these stereotyped attitudes are changed that a woman will be able to gain recognition in the labor force as a capable and intelligent individual.

colleges and universities. By doing this, they hope to make it possible for motivated women to enter into the types of careers which are traditionally dominated by men.

Today's society is governed by the idea of male chauvinism, in which feminists see as much prejudice against the woman as there is against the black. However, as Dr. Garskof explains, this feeling of male superiority is perpetuated as much by women as it is by men. "We as women are chauvinistic when we go to men for answers or when we ask them to do things for us that we could do if we tried; when we assume that we are incapable of doing intellectual and artistic things that come under the male's world." Chauvinism takes many forms, including age-old rules of etiquette; for example, a man is expected to open doors for a woman, although she may be perfectly capable of opening them herself. Dr. Garskof regards this as an attempt at a buy-off: "Having a door opened is hardly sufficient payment for being relegated to laundress and bed-maker for one's whole life. I would rather be treated as a competent, intelligent individual and given the

opportunity to develop and live like one."

"I've been trying in my women course to make the women in the class think about where they stand in society; and how the ideas about women and men have been formed and have been given to them intact, and how they've never questioned them sometimes."

Dr. Garskof considers herself a part of the Women's Liberation Movement, a "very loosely-associated conglomerate of women who have gotten themselves together in response to certain problems. Some women are dealing with discrimination in their professions . . . others have gotten together because there are not adequate childcare facilities, because they can't get jobs that they're qualified to get, because they can't get into graduate school, because they can't get into college; because of a variety of reasons. And in that sense I'm very much a part of the Women's Liberation Movement."

"I'm not an active participant organizationally, but I certainly don't want to deny my ties to the movement, and my allegiance to it."

UVa chauvinist seeks dating service

Last month the Student Government Association received a letter asking for cooperation in providing dates for men at the University of Virginia. The text of the letter follows: Mr./Mrs. President,

The University of Virginia is starting a student dating service under the direction of yours truly. The objective of this organization is to provide dates for U. Va. men with girls at neighboring colleges and with the few girls at U. Va., and vice versa. To do this, questionnaires would be needed for both male and female. By using the information on these questionnaires, a select group of club members would arrange dates and then inform both parties involved. The boy would be given the girl's name, address, and telephone number. This service would cost the girl nothing more than a little time and a 6¢ stamp to mail her questionnaire in. Since the service is mainly for the men at U. Va., their questionnaires would be kept on file, (naturally all information would be confidential.) We could not possibly keep the female questionnaires on file since the

large number would make this infeasible. Then again we realize it is a girls' prerogative to change her mind, which again makes this infeasible. Any money the club makes would be a service charge for the guy to get a date.

This service would be open to all students in the participating universities. This service is meant for people who can't get a date for a weekend and want one, but don't want to impose on their friends. We realize that not everyone would use the service, but we know there would be enough people to make it work.

Now that you know a little about the system, let me tell you my main reason for writing you. The club needs people at the other end to control the distribution of questionnaires and handle any small problems that may crop up. (The club will have its own complaint department.) Mainly this person would see that no "crank" questionnaires were sent to us. This person would also see that duplicate questionnaires were made for his or hers college.

But, it is now urgent that we get some sort of response from you as soon as possible. We need either a yes, no, or maybe and what you plan to do. Send us examples of what you think the questionnaires should look like and any other questions you have. Please include names and phone numbers if possible, and any correction in address. Remember this service is for all students at your university, but mainly for the girls. This same letter has been sent to 14 other colleges. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,
Walter I. Kerns, President
304 Emmet, Station No. 1
Univ. of Va.
Charlottesville, Va. 22904

SGA replied to Mr. Kerns:

Dear Sir: Concerning your letter of December 7, 1969, no thank you. The women at Mary Washington College are not interested in dating the boys from the University of Virginia.

feedback

ACLU lawyer replies to Allen's accusations

Dear Editor:

I should like to reply to the letter by Professor Philip J. Allen (The BULLET, Dec. 16) for I believe that Professor Allen has not dealt with the issues raised by the American Civil Liberties Union or by Mr. Hirschkop.

It is the contention of the ACLU that the state cannot maintain segregated institutions of higher learning, whether that segregation be sexual or racial. To deny any citizen the opportunity to utilize a state institution on the basis of sex is, in our view, contrary to the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In the case of the University of Virginia, the discrimination is directed against women; in the cases of Mary Washington College and Radford College, the discrimination is against men who might wish to attend those institutions.

In the course of researching the suit to admit women to the University of Virginia, we performed a detailed study of higher education in the Commonwealth. Three of the more relevant facts we unearthed are these:

1) The state expends more money per capita on University of Virginia students than on students anywhere else in the state system; there is a difference of almost six hundred dollars between expenditures at U. Va. and the second ranking school.

2) The size, range and scope of course and degree offerings at the University of Virginia is vastly superior to that offered anywhere else in the state system.

3) The overwhelming weight of modern educational theory today holds that sexually segregated education is detrimental to the overall quality of education offered at such institutions.

Stated simply, the denial of admission to the University of Virginia denies an opportunity to women who might seek it. Surely, many women receive a fine education at Mary Washington; but in the sciences, languages, certain humanities, they are denied the opportunity of a better education, an opportunity in Virginia arbitrarily restricted to men.

The restrictive policy of the University of Virginia has been part of an overall state policy, one that has restricted female enrollment at William and Mary, and has relegated women to schools (Madison, Radford, Longwood) that are educationally inferior. In part, of course, this only reflects the historically subordinate role of women in Southern life.

Professor Allen has chosen to interpret the ACLU position as stated at Mary Washington by Mr. Hirschkop—as an attack upon your Chancellor and school. If your Chancellor adopts a "paternalistic" attitude toward female education, he stands convicted by his own words, not mine or Mr. Hirschkop's. After all, it was the Chancellor who defended as a positive good the limited program offered at Mary Washington to women.

I should hope that Professor Allen would deal with the merits of the issue rather than flailing at straw men. No one in the ACLU has attacked your leaders or your school; our attack, if that is the

proper word, has been directed against violations of the Constitution, against denial to women of equal rights and opportunities.

Lauren Seldon,
Executive Director,
ACLU of Virginia

Alumna admonishes editor of BULLET

Dear Editor:

As a concerned alumna I am compelled to write. In your editorials in the past nine issues of the BULLET the vein of thinking has been dissatisfaction and unhappiness with school policies. You knew what the rules were when you applied for admission to Mary Washington. Surely you could have found another college with regulations to suit your tastes.

Now, you, as editor of the BULLET, are in a position to build up the morale and image of the school. This office is an honor and a privilege. Why are you trying to sow seeds of dissent and unrest? You are helping the enemies of the United States and the tyrants of the world in supporting these issues.

You have shown no appreciation for what you have in your lovely school in any of your writings. Do you think the taxpayers consider you worthy of the privilege which is yours at Mary Washington?

Life is short. Why waste your time and thoughts on such low-brow thinking as was given "The Student as Nigger"? The language used in this article was not fit to be in print. You gave it one full page of space.

I would appreciate an answer to the questions I have asked. I hope in this new year you will be able to get your thinking out of the cellar and on a higher level. Whatever you sow you can expect to reap. Please let it be directed toward nobler living, and preservation of our great heritage and country.

Mrs. Louise H. Massie
Class of '39

Plan suggested for library loan

To the Editor:

I would like to comment on the BULLET article "Inter-Library Loan: Cause of Confusion," (Dec. 16, 1969)

First, there is a factual error. Professors Fingerhut and Saunders were not involved in the discussions of inter-library loan policy with Dr. Woodward, the Director of the Library. The group actually consisted of Professors Vance, Slayton and me.

Second, we did not get "nowhere" with Dr. Woodward, for he quite frankly explained Mary Washington's inter-library loan procedure for us.

Third, I was disappointed that the author of this article chose to quote me as inferring that Dr. Woodward is following some kind of broader administration policy designed to preserve Mary Washington's autonomy from the University of Virginia. The relation-

ship between the two schools is involved in the question, but it was not my feeling that this has anything to do with Dr. Woodward's views on inter-library loan procedures.

I personally feel that the only feasible type of arrangement which might be made to improve or regularize inter-library loan procedure would be the following:

1. That an inter-campus loan be formally arranged between Mary Washington's Trinkle Library and the University of Virginia's Alderman Library limited to students enrolled in 490-level courses, which is the designation for research oriented courses.

2. That the library be given lists of students registered in these courses to check student eligibility for an inter-campus loan.

3. That the students' instructor or independent study advisor check the students' list of loan requests to insure its pertinence to her research project.

4. That each student eligible for an inter-campus loan be advised to check her requests carefully to insure that they do not actually exist in our library.

5. That students in courses which involve inter-campus loan privileges be encouraged to take a bibliographical field trip to the Alderman Library before making her requests, if possible.

Richard Warner
Department of History

Psych students find courses here unstimulating

Recently in an Adolescent Psychology class we were discussing protest and revolt among college students. The subject under scrutiny was how well do colleges meet the needs of their students. Soon we began to focus specifically on courses offered at Mary Washington College. It issued the question, "How many find over half their courses stimulating and valuable this semester?"

Only a few out of the thirty students raised their hands. When I changed the question to, "How many find all but one course stimulating and valuable?", no one raised a hand. Next I queried, "Well, what is wrong, and what would you suggest be done?"

Responses poured out of the students, and when we had completed a long list we decided to speak out by sending them to the BULLET. So here is our list of suggestions and criticisms:

1. Often class lectures are outdated and unstimulating.

2. The faculty seems limited in breadth of field and knowledge.

3. Students gain too little knowledge of professors' interests.

4. Professors are rarely open to criticisms and questions.

5. Classes are too full of apathetic students who often are in the class only because it is required.

6. There are too many college requirements.

7. Introductory courses which are required of all majors in many departments are too geared to their needs, but should also consider the needs of the other students in the class.

8. Students work for professors and professors expect them

editorial

Men may enter but are not appreciated

The Chancellor's recent announcement, that MWC will become coeducational in 1970 (see page 2) was welcome but regrettably late. By delaying the decision until the end of December the Chancellor insured that next year MWC will be coeducational in name only, with only token male enrollment. Since high school seniors usually submit college applications by November, it is probable that very few well-qualified men will apply. Also, since College Night programs are held in the fall, the opportunity to publicize our coed status and recruit in Virginia high schools was lost by waiting until December to make the announcement.

Apparently Chancellor Simpson was not particularly eager to implement a significant degree of coeducation for 1970. Had he been, he would have moved earlier and more energetically toward coeducation. As it is, the decision appears to be a reluctant one, made under the pressure of a threatened ACLU suit and impending court action.

The Chancellor knew well before its October report was released that the Future of the College Committee would recommend becoming coeducational. He must have realized, too, that unless he made the decision to coeducate, ACLU would have decided the matter for him. In light of these factors, the Chancellor's apparent reluctance to coeducate is strange. And even stranger is that now he claims to favor coeducation because it is "natural," quite a change from his position in his testimony to the ACLU, and a remarkable metamorphosis for a man who once said, "Coeducation means living together, not learning together, and I don't think we have to provide that."

Even though it is too late for real coeducation in 1970, it is quite possible to work and plan for a large and well-qualified male enrollment in 1971. By that time, hopefully, the Ad Hoc Committee on Degree Requirements and College Caidender will have finished its work, and the College can offer an attractive curriculum to top liberal arts applicants, male and female. Also by that time, SGA or its replacement will have completed an extensive recruiting program.

Mary Washington (or the University of Virginia at Fredericksburg, or whatever) has the opportunity to become a top liberal arts institution, with equality for men and women. It can avoid football, fraternities, separate dorms, and the "man-is-always-the-president - woman-is-always-the-secretary" syndrome.

Perhaps it is too much to hope, but it is possible that Virginia may yet offer its women "educational opportunities equal to those provided by the state for men."

AG

front page photo by Shelia Page

THE BULLET

anne gordon greaver
barbara halliday
barbara bennett
vicki lillicrapp
jane touzalin
becky smith
anne sylvestre
shelia page
jody reed
ruth foster
cathy giles
gladys swanson

editor
managing
business
news
features
photography
advertising
photography
exchange
circulation
news assistant
general secretary

The opinions expressed herein are not necessarily those of the College or the student body, nor are opinions expressed in signed articles and columns necessarily those of the editor or all members of the editorial board.

Subscriptions are \$4.00 per year. Write THE BULLET, Box 1115, College Station, Fredericksburg, Va. 22401.

(see FEEDBACK, page 7)

Understanding orgasm

Tiresias, who had been both man and woman, was asked, as Ovid's legend goes, to mediate in a dispute between Jove and Juno as to which sex got more pleasure from lovemaking. Tiresias unhesitatingly answered that women did. Yet in the intervening 2000 years between Ovid's time and our own, a mythology has been built up which not only holds the opposite to be true, but has made this belief an unswerving ideology dictating the quality of relations between the sexes. Women's sexuality, defined by men to benefit men, has been down-graded and perverted, repressed and channeled, denied and abused until women themselves, thoroughly convinced of their sexual inferiority to men, would probably be dumbfounded to learn that there is scientific proof that Tiresias was indeed right.

The myth was codified by Freud as much as anyone else. In Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, Freud formulated his basic ideas concerning feminine sexuality: for little girls, the leading erogenous zone in their bodies is the clitoris; in order for the transition to womanhood to be successful, the clitoris must abandon its sexual primacy to the vagina; women in whom this transition has not been complete remain clitorally-oriented, or "sexually anaesthetic," and "psychosexually immature." In the context of Freud's total psychoanalytic view of women—that they are not whole human beings but mutilated males who long all their lives for a penis and must struggle to reconcile themselves to its lack—the requirement of a transfer of erotic sensation from clitoris to vagina became a *prima facie* case for their inevitable sexual inferiority. In Freud's logic, those who struggle to become what they are not must be inferior to that to which they aspire.

Freud himself admitted near the end of his life that his knowledge of women was inadequate. "If you want to know more about femininity, you must interrogate your own experience, or turn to the poets, or wait until science can give you more profound and more coherent information," he said; he also hoped the female psychoanalysts who followed him would be able to find out more. But the post-Freudians adhered rigidly to the doctrine of the master, and, as with most of his work, what Freud hoped would be taken as a thesis for future study became instead a kind of canon law.

While the neo-Freudians haggle over the correct reading of the Freudian bible, watered-

down Freudianism was wending its way into the cultural mythology via Broadway plays, novels, popular magazines, social scientists, marriage counselors and experts of various kinds who found it useful in projecting desired images of woman. The superiority of the vaginal over the clitoral orgasm was particularly useful as a theory, since it provided a convenient basis for categorization: clitoral women were deemed immature, neurotic, bitchy and masculine; women who had vaginal orgasms were maternal, feminine, mature and normal. Though frigidity should technically be defined as total inability to achieve orgasm, the orthodox Freudians (and pseudo-Freudians) preferred to define it as inability to achieve vaginal orgasm, by which definition, in 1944, Edmond Bergler adjudged between 70 and 80 per cent of all women frigid. The clitoral importance of the clitoris to female orgasm and contradicted Bergler's statistics—but it became clear that there was something indispensable to society in the Freudian view which allowed it to remain unchallenged in the public consciousness.

In 1966, Dr. William H. Masters and Mrs. Virginia E. Johnson published Human Sexual Response a massive clinical study of the physiology of sex. Briefly and simply, the Masters and Johnson conclusions about the female orgasm, based on observation of an interview with 487 women, were these:

1) That the dichotomy of vaginal and clitoral orgasms is entirely false. Anatomically, all orgasms are centered in the clitoris, whether they result from direct manual pressure applied to the clitoris, indirect pressure resulting from the thrusting of penis during intercourse, or generalized sexual stimulation of other erogenous zones like the breasts.

2) That women are naturally multiorgasmic; that is, if a woman is immediately stimulated following orgasm, she is likely to experience several orgasms in rapid succession. This is not an exceptional occurrence, but one of which most women are capable.

3) That while women's orgasms do not vary in kind, they vary in intensity. The most intense orgasms experienced by the research subjects were by masturbatory manual stimulation, followed in intensity by manual stimulation by the partner; the least intense orgasms were experienced during intercourse.

4) That there is an "infinite variety in female sexual response" as regards intensity and duration of orgasms.

To anyone acquainted with the body of existing knowledge of feminine sexuality, the Masters and Johnson findings were truly revolutionary and liberating in

the extent to which they demolished the established myths. Yet two years after the study was published, it seems hardly to have made any impact at all. Certainly it is not for lack of information that the myths persist; Human Sexual Response, despite its weighty scientific language, was an immediate best seller, and popular paperbacks explicated it to millions of people in simpler language and at a cheaper price. The myths remain because male-dominated American culture has a vested interest in their continuance.

Before Masters and Johnson, men defined feminine sexuality in a way as favorable to themselves as possible. If woman's pleasure was obtained through the vagina, then she was totally dependent on the man's erect penis to achieve orgasm; she would receive her satisfaction only as a concomitant of man's seeking his. With the clitoral orgasm, woman's sexual pleasure was independent of the male's, and she could seek her satisfaction as aggressively as the man sought his, a prospect which didn't appeal to too many men. The definition of feminine sexuality as normally vaginal, in other words, was a part of keeping women down, of making them sexually as well as economically, socially and politically subservient.

In retrospect, particularly with the additional perspective of our own times, Freud's theory of feminine sexuality appears an historical rationalization for the realities of Victorian society. A prisoner of the Victorian ethos, Freud had to play the paternalist. Freud's analysis implied that woman's low status has not been conferred upon her by men, but by God, who created her without a penis.

The superiority of the vaginal orgasm seems almost a determination on Freud's part to complete the Victorians' repression of feminine eroticism, to stigmatize the remaining vestiges of pleasure felt by women and this makes them unacceptable to the women themselves. For there were still women whose sexuality hadn't been completely destroyed, as evidenced by one Dr. Isaac Brown Baker, a surgeon who performed numerous clitoridectomies on women to prevent the sexual excitement which, he was convinced, caused "insanities," "catalepsy," "hysteria," "epilepsy" and other diseases. The Victorians needed to repress sexuality for the success of Western industrialized society; in particular, the total repression of woman's sexuality was crucial to ensure her subjugation. So the Victorians honored only that aspect of sexuality which was necessary to the survival of the species—the male ejaculation; made women submissive to sex by creating a mystique of the sanctuary of motherhood; and, supported by Freud, passed onto

us the heritage of the double standard.

When Kinsey laid to rest the part of the double standard that maintained women got no pleasure at all from sex, everyone cried out that there was a sexual revolution afoot. But such talk, as usual, was deceptive. Morality, outside the marriage bed, remained the same, and children were socialized as though Kinsey had never described what they would be like when they grew up. Boys were taught that they should get their sex where they could find it, "go as far" as they could. On the old assumption that women were asexual creatures, girls were taught that whatever sex education adolescents did manage to receive, they were told that men had penises and women vaginas; the existence of the clitoris was not mentioned, and pleasure in sex was never discussed at all.

Adolescent boys growing up begging for sexual crumbs from girls frightened for their "reputations"—a situation guard of a sexual revolution. However, the marriage manual craze that followed Kinsey assumed that a lifetime of psychological destruction could, with the aid of a little booklet, be abandoned after marriage, and that husband and wife should be able to make sure that the wife was not robbed of her sexual birthright to orgasm, just so long as it was vaginal (though the marriage manuals did rather reluctantly admit that since the clitoris was the most sexually sensitive organ in the female body, a little clitoral stimulation was in order), and so long as their orgasms were simultaneous.

The effect of the marriage manuals of course ran counter to their ostensible purpose. Under the guise of frankness and sexual liberation, they dictated prudery and restraint. Sex was made so mechanized, detached and intellectual that it was robbed of its sensuality. Man became a spectator of his own sexual experience. And the marriage manuals put new pressure on women. The swing was from repression to pre-occupation with the orgasm. Men took the marriage manuals to mean that their sexuality would be enhanced by bringing women to orgasm and, again coopting feminine sexuality for their own ends, they put pressure on women to perform. The marriage manuals' endorsement of the desirability of vaginal orgasm insured that women would be asked not only, "did you come?" but also, "Did you conform to Freud's conception of a psycho-sexually mature woman, and thereby validate my masculinity?"

Appearances notwithstanding, the age-old toboos against conversation about personal sexual experience haven't yet been broken down. This reticence has allowed the mind-manipulators of the media to create myths of sexual supermen and superwomen. So the bed becomes a

competitive arena, where men and women measure themselves against these mythical rivals, while simultaneously trying to live up to the ecstasies promised them by the marriage manuals.

As anthropologists have shown, woman's sexual response is culturally conditioned; historically, women defer to whatever model of their sexuality is offered them by men. So the sad thing for women is that they have participated in the destruction of their own eroticism. Women have helped make the vaginal orgasm into a status symbol in a male-dictated system of values. A woman would now perceive her preference for clitoral orgasm as a "secret shame," ignominious in the eyes of other women as well as those of men. This internalization can be seen in literature: Mary McCarthy and Doris Lessing's writings on orgasm do not differ substantially from Ernest Hemingway's, and Simone de Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex*, refers to vaginal orgasm as the only "normal satisfaction."

One factor that has made this possible is that female sexuality is subtle and delicate, conditioned as much by the emotions as by physiology and sociology. Masters and Johnson proved that the orgasm experienced during intercourse, the misnamed vaginal orgasm, did not differ anatomically from the clitoral orgasm. But this should not be seen as their most significant contribution to the sexual emancipation of women. A difference remains in the subjective experience of orgasm during intercourse and orgasm apart from intercourse. In the complex of emotional factors affecting feminine sexuality, there is a whole panoply of pleasures: the pleasure of being penetrated and filled by a man, the pleasure of sexual communication, the pleasure of affording a man his orgasm, the erotic pleasure that exists even when sex is not terminated by orgasmic release. Masters and Johnson's real contribution was to show this "infinite variety in female sexual response"; that one experience is not better than another, but merely different.

There is no doubt that Masters and Johnson were fully aware of the implications of their study to the sexual liberation of women. As they wrote, "With orgasmic physiology established, the human female now has an undeniable opportunity to develop realistically her own sexual response levels." Two years later this statement seems naive and entirely too optimistic. Certainly the sexual problems of our society will never be solved until there is real and unfeigned equality between men and women. This idea is usually misconstrued: sexual liberation for women is wrongly understood to mean that women will adopt all the forms of masculine sexuality. As in the whole issue of women's liberation, that's really not the point. Women don't aspire to imitate the mistakes of men in sexual matters, to view sexual experiences as conquest and ego-enhancement, to use other people to serve their own ends. But if the Masters and Johnson material is allowed to filter into the public consciousness, hopefully to replace the enshrined Freudian myths, then woman at long last will be allowed to take the first step toward her emancipation: to define the enjoy the forms of her own sexuality.

SUMMER JOBS IN EUROPE CONSIDER EUROJOB

offers a wide variety of summer employment opportunities
8 week program consists of a 4-day orientation and 2 weeks free to travel... arranged transportation, room, board, work, visa, job, and country, all-inclusive fee—\$450. Further information and applications may be obtained by writing to

EUROJOB, DEPT. CRP,
102 Greenwich Ave.,
Conn. 06830

or by contacting

LYNDA HORNER,
Custis 307 Ext. 476

Interested in
Student
Spring Trip
to
BERMUDA?
Contact: Helen Hopkins
ext. 454

Natural Child
Coffee House
103 Butler Road

Wed. nite 8-12

open host

Friday & Saturday
Nites

9-2

Love folk & blues
performers

Classified

ATTENTION MWC FACULTY AND STUDENTS. Services of a professional typist available—experience in dissertations, theses, papers, etc. Contact Elizabeth Bourdon, 371-4168.

WANTED

THE SERVICES OF A HYPNOTIST—If interested please call Catherine White, Willard Ext. 425, or write Box 1846, College Station.

Proposed constitutional revisions

ARTICLE II: POWERS

Section 1. The Student Association shall have the power to regulate all student activities and organizations at the college, with the exception of the Honor Council, through the passage of appropriate legislation and resolutions.

Section 2. In regulating student activities and organizations, the Student Association shall have the following powers:

a. To recognize any student organization at the College within its jurisdiction; to impose conditions or qualifications upon the grant of recognition or the continuance of recognition; to withdraw recognition; and to enforce these rules by appropriate action.

b. To approve allocations of student activities fees upon proper application of student organizations, with the exception of those organizations falling under the jurisdiction of the Board of Publications.

Section 3. The Student Association shall have the power to investigate any matter affecting the welfare of the Student Body and the College and to make recommendations which will foster the best interest of the College and the Student Body.

Section 4. The Student Association shall have the power to regulate all Student Association elections, all Honor Council elections and all class officer elections.

ARTICLE IV

Section 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in one legislative body, a student Senate.

Section 2. Each residence hall shall have at least one senator notwithstanding the number of residents in said residence hall. Each residence hall containing more than 50 students shall be represented by one senator from each district of 50 students and one additional senator when an increment of fifty is exceeded by thirty students. There shall be at least one senator for every full time equivalent of 50 day students and one additional senator when an increment of 50 is exceeded by 30 students. There shall be one senator-at-large elected by the student body during the second semester.

Section 3. Senate elections shall be held at the beginning of each semester. Each senator shall be elected for a term on one semester and shall be eligible for re-election. Each senator shall have one vote.

Section 4. No student shall be a senator who is not in good standing academically and socially.

Section 5. The Legislative Chairman of the Student Association shall be president of the Senate, but shall have no vote unless the vote be equally divided. In the event of the Legislative Chairman's absence, the senator-at-large shall call a meeting of the Senate and shall preside over such a meeting.

Section 6. Two thirds of the Senate shall constitute a quorum to do business. Proposals referred to the Senate must be introduced by any member of the Student Association. A proposal which passes the Senate shall be presented to the Executive Chairman of the Student Association before it is referred to the appropriate body. The proposal may be approved by the Executive Chairman, or if vetoed by the Executive Chairman, shall be returned to the Senate for debate. A two-thirds vote of the Senate shall

override the executive chairman's veto.

Section 7. The Senate shall be organized into standing and temporary committees for the efficient performance of its duties. The standing committees of the Senate shall include:

- A Legislative Revision Committee
- An elections committee
- A publicity committee
- An orientation committee
- A national, state and community concerns committee

The President of the Senate shall appoint temporary chairmen for the standing committees in the spring of the year. These chairmen shall retain their offices on a vote of confidence from their committee members in the fall.

Section 8. The senate shall have power:

- To originate policies, proposals and legislation
- To act on recommendations of the standing and ad hoc committees, executive cabinet and individual students.
- To promote cultural affairs and speakers programs.
- To establish election procedures for all campus elections
- To approve the expenditures of the Student Association funds
- To develop orientation programming for new students
- To provide for and maintain campus publicity
- To promote contact with other colleges and universities on the national and state levels, and to promote active communication with the local community.
- To publish the Student Handbook.

To enhance the role of the student in determining academic policy by formulating recommendations to college committees and to the college administration.

feedback

(from FEEDBACK, page 3)

to, when it should be the other way around—professors working for the students.

9. Majors would like to help decide the departmental requirements which they must fulfill.

10. Elimination of separate departmental structure might be a good change.

11. There is a need for more leeway for different kinds of learning experiences.

12. Don't like the structure of examinations and don't think they are called for in all situations.

13. Don't like "instant replay" tests.

14. Don't like comprehensive tests as a criterion for graduation.

15. Find lower level courses too factual and dull and upper level courses too general and dull.

16. Find the guidance services inadequate and feel that they tend to discourage those who want to go to graduate school rather than going into teaching, etc. At this point, the bell intervened.

Psychology 332D and Mrs. Rabson

Grades repress Student freedom

Dear Editor:

Your editorial in the Dec. 11 issue of the BULLET said a great deal that is usually left unsaid, at least in print.

The educational system which you rightfully condemn, and which "most of us are too blind even to recognize," is a collectivist system. It bears no relationship to other types of business activities that occur in this country (except government business activities). It is a system of privilege, a system that could easily be compared to the mili-

tary establishment, a system in which the economics is Keynesian (socialistic), a system that fosters hypocrisy and subservience, a system which suffocates self-esteem nurtures a strong feeling of guilt and trains students for practical slavery.

There is but one way to bring about the complete change that is needed at all levels of education: operate education in the same manner as any other free enterprise business. In such an environment "the customer is always right." Which means that the paying students (or their parents in the case of very young children) would be in a position to judge the quality of the service (teaching) offered, and to accept or reject it at will.

Gerald Farber pointed out in his unnecessarily crude, but accurate, article entitled "The Student as Nigger", that what is needed is an educational system that would "make academic freedom bilateral." This means that both parties involved in the classroom situation must be free to express themselves. At present the students dare not say what they really think, for fear of jeopardizing their grades—freedom of expression (which is what academic freedom really means) does not exist for students.

George B. Leonard, Look Senior Editor, recently wrote that "grades are the glue that holds an obsolete contraption called college together." Only when grades, and degrees are eliminated will the student be free to use his mind freely and to study that which he finds of real value. As Mr. Farber put it—"they could study eagerly and learn prodigiously for the best of all possible reasons—their own reasons."

Thomas Johnson
Dept. of Biology

Professor urges cooperation in decision making

Dear Editor:

Last year I happened by chance to read in the Free-Lance Star that someone had made the decision to admit men to the summer session. Had I not accidentally seen this particular issue of the paper I suppose that local gossip would eventually have instructed me to expect men in my summer classes.

Mary Washington will become coeducational in 1970, or so I am informed, again by a somewhat dated issue of the Free-Lance Star.

At many institutions today major decisions would never be made independently of the faculty and students. At Mary Washington, however, the status of faculty and students presumably does not demand that they even be informed when such decisions have been made.

Glen R. Thomas
American Studies

BULLET will elect new staff

The BULLET is now accepting applications for all staff positions. Any interested student should submit a written application for a specific position to the Bulletin officer in ACL by Friday, Jan. 16.

No previous experience on the BULLET staff is required of applicants.

news in Brief

The National, State, and Community Concerns Committee of the Senate will close its Biafra drive this week. On Wednesday, Jan. 14, bar soap will be collected in each senatorial district. A party will be given to the dorm which contributes the largest amount of soap per capita.

The soap will then be sent to the National Biafra Relief Services Foundation. From there it will be sent to Biafra, where it will be used for sanitation and disease prevention.

A total of \$15.50 has been collected from canisters in dormitories. This money will be sent to the Relief Foundation, along with the amount collected from canisters in the Fredericksburg area.

The MWC Band will present its winter concert Tuesday at 8 p.m. in DuPont auditorium.

The 28-member group, conducted by Mr. James Baker, will perform a varied program, including a portion of a Mozart french horn concerto with Lucinda Rathwell playing the solo part.

The concert will open with Haydn's "March for the Prince of Wales," and Handel's "Thanks Be To Thee."

Other major works on the program will be the "Flandria Overture" by Jean De Smet and "Adagio Pathetique" by the late-nineteenth century American composer Benjamin Godard.

One light work on the program will be "Six Little Songs," a collection of nursery tunes given modern-sounding arrangements.

exhibition
& sale of
original
graphics
for collectors

by
Chagall,
Baskin,
Rouault,
Daumier
& many
others

Arranged by
Ferdinand
Rosen Galleries,
Baltimore, Md.



Mary Washington
College
WESLEY FOUNDATION
MONDAY, JANUARY 12
10 A.M. to 5 P.M.



sale

we're clearing our current stocks of fine fashions. Now, we want to place these items in the care of those who appreciate fine quality. reductions to 1/2 and more may seem heartless, but.... it's for the best.

LA VOGUE

WSS GIRLS GET THE BEST JOBS •
The
WASHINGTON SCHOOL FOR SECRETARIES
529 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C.

ALLISON'S

ONE HOUR
"MARTINIZING."
THE MOST IN DRY CLEANING

SPECIALS

Every Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday

Ladies Plain Suit.....	90¢
Plain Dress	90¢
Plain Skirt	50¢
Slacks, Slacks, Slacks,	50¢

1 Hr. Service At No Extra Charge

Open 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
Monday thru Saturday

1230 Jefferson Davis Blvd.
Phone: 373-4777

VICTORIA

373-7321

ENDS TUESDAY
Shows at 7:00 & 9:00 P.M.

"ALICE'S RESTAURANT"

Starts Wednesday
FOR ONE WEEK

WOODY ALLEN'S
"TAKE THE MONEY AND RUN"

—Coming Soon—
"FUNNY GIRL"
"EASY RIDER"

COLONIAL

373-4881

ENDS TUESDAY
Shows at 7:00 & 9:00 P.M.

"Belle de Jour"

Starts Wednesday
Through Sat.—4 Days

"Last Summer"

—Coming Soon—
"DR. ZHIVAGO"
"101 DALMATIANS"



ALICE'S RESTAURANT

\$3.99



\$2.99

(Alice's Restaurant movie is now playing at our local Victoria theatre, and will continue through Tuesday night starring Arlo Guthrie.)



"The only full line record shop in town."

Phone 373-6488


a full line of Musical Accessories



Record Shop

818 Caroline

\$3.99




Haber

... for the woman of taste

Jet black beauty with that new gleaming wet look, enhanced by a rich falled Edwardian collar. Snug-waisted, double-breasted maxi length, quilt lined to keep you warm as toast.

\$65



Haber

FREDERICKSBURG
PARK & SHOP CENTER
Open Daily & Saturdays
10 A.M. TO 9 P.M.

**We've been thinking
about tomorrow . . .**

**What's the difference
if we don't wake up?**

